

# **HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

## **Minutes**

October 14, 2004

Salisbury, North Carolina

The Historic Preservation Commission for the city of Salisbury met in regular session on Thursday, October 14, 2004, in the Council Chambers at the City Hall, 132 N. Main Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Charles Paul. In addition to Mr. Paul, the following members were present: Raemi Evans, Ronald Fleming, Mike Fuller, Anne Lyles, Jeff Sowers, Wayne Whitman and Michael Young

Absent: Kathy Walters

### **Certificates of Appropriateness**

H-52-04    **202 E. Bank St.** – Clyde Overcash, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness for metal roof – Red

#### **Not Present For the Meeting**

H-53-04    **1010 N. Main St.** – Thomas & Clara Marts, owner – Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of wooden deck on rear of house

#### **Not Present For the Meeting**

H-56-04    **130 E. Liberty St.** – City of Salisbury, owner – Deb Young, applicant – Certificate of Appropriateness for submission of spandrel glass sample for the Police Department addition

Karen Alexander of KKA Architecture was sworn to give testimony as agent for the Police Department. Commission member Jeff Sowers was excused from his seat for the hearing of this request.

Ms. Alexander began her testimony by reminding the Commission that the spandrel glass was not approved on a previous application (H-39-04) because a sample of the glass was not presented at the meeting. Ms. Alexander then presented the sample.

Staff presented slides from which Ms. Alexander showed the elevations visible from Liberty St. Also from slides, Ms. Alexander pointed out the larger windows on the lower level of the building that would have the spandrel glass panels in them. She testified that the upper cross design windows would be clear glass, and tinted very similar like the glass in the spandrel panels. A sample of each type of glass was presented.

Ms. Alexander suggested that Commission members move to the outside in order to better see the contrast in the 2 windows. She said the reflection of the sunlight on the windows would allow them to see that it is very difficult to distinguish the difference.

Ms. Alexander explained that as requested by the police chief, all administrative offices would be located on the lower level, and he did not want clear glass windows so close to the sidewalk for the sake of security. She said the natural light would come from the top windows; no light at all would go through the spandrel glass. The back side, she said, would not look like a window but would have insulation and sheet-rock.

In response to a question from Michael Young relative to bullet-proof glass, Ms. Alexander said that bullet-proof glass is no longer considered bullet proof because of the type ammunition used now. The glass would not be able to stop it, she said. She stated that the only other alternative would have been to brick the windows up, and they all felt the spandrel to be a better solution.

In response to a question from Anne Lyles who asked what spandrel is, Ms. Alexander described it is a glass product that is dark; no light can be emitted through it.

Michael Young asked if when looking from across the street at the windows would it be obvious that the bottom panels were spandrel. Ms. Alexander said there would be a difference especially at night.

Commission members proceeded to the outside in order to view the difference in the 2 types of glass.

Upon returning to the inside, and no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request, Ronald Fleming made the following motion: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning application #H-56-04 – that Karen Alexander of KKA Architecture, representative for the city of Salisbury, owner of 130 E. Liberty St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to obtain approval for spandrel glass for the Police Department addition; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 3 New Construction – Addition, pages 46-49; guidelines 11-16 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; mitigating factor: the glass sample was presented at the request of HPC; therefore, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for application H-56-04 be granted to Karen Alexander of KKA Architecture representative for the city of Salisbury, owner of 130 E. Liberty to make the changes detailed in the application."

Wayne Whitman seconded the motion.

Michael Young read the following guideline: Changes to Buildings - Windows and Doors, page 30, which reads – *the use of reflective or highly tinted glass is discouraged*. He then stated that the request is a unique situation, a unique building and a unique use, and he would support it, but he did not think the committee should get into a habit of approving such a request.

The Chair called for the vote. All members present voted AYE.

Michael Young refused himself for the hearing of the following requests:

**H-57-04 107-113 E. Innes St. – LMY, Inc., owner – Certificate of Appropriateness** to replace existing awning fabric with new fabric on front elevation that matches in color and style; repaint the upper story windows in colors to match existing; install accent lighting similar to the lighting installed on the Plaza, fixtures to be located above the mid-level cornice

**H-58-04 117 E. Innes St. – LMY, Inc., owner – Certificate of Appropriateness** for historic rehabilitation project (see attached description and drawings)

Michael & Diane Young, LMY, Inc., were sworn to give testimony for the requests.

Staff presented slides.

Ms. Young began testimony for 107-113 E. Innes St. stating that the changes at that location would be minor. She then testified that the fabric on the existing awning would be replaced with identical fabric. The upper-store windows would be repaired, and repainted in the exact same colors. Ms. Young further testified that they would like to add up-lighting located directly above the mid-level cornice shooting upward. She stated there would probably be 1 fixture per bay, as has already been done at the Plaza. The lights would be soft, she said.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Jeff Sowers made the following motion: “I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning application #H-57-04 – that Diane & Michael Young, applicant for LMY, Inc., owner of 107 and 113 E. Innes St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing awning fabric on front elevation that matches the color and style; repaint upper story windows to match the existing, and install accent lighting similar to that on the Plaza, located above the mid-level cornice; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2 – Changes to Buildings – Windows and Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1-4 and 10; Utilities and Energy Retrofit, pages 42-43, guideline 7;

Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting – Lighting, page 61, guidelines 1-6 of the Non-Residential Design Guidelines; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application #H-57-04 be granted to Diane & Michael Young, applicant for LMT, Inc., owner of 107 and 113 E. Innes St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Ronald Fleming seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

### **117 E. Innes St.**

Ms. Young informed the Commission that historic rehabilitation tax credits are being used for the project; therefore, the work will be reviewed by the NC Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service for compliance to Secretary of Interior Standards. She further stated that Paul Fomberg from the Preservation Office has already met with her and is agreeable with what is being done.

Staff presented slides as Ms. Young presented testimony on the proposed scope of work as follows:

#### Front elevation

- paint colors will match the building next door (107-113 E. Innes St.).
- the masonry façade would be cleaned using mild chemicals and low-pressure water spray
- the existing masonry kick-plates located below the display windows will remain in place and re-painted
- the display windows and the transoms above the display windows will also remain; the center transom will be re-opened and re-built to match the existing transoms on both sides with wood framing
- the openings at the sides of the recessed entry will be uncovered, existing paneling removed, and glass installed in wood frames
- the existing aluminum framed entry door and sidelight, and the aluminum framed window located to the left of the center masonry column will be removed and 8 ft. tall wood stained doors with a transom above will be installed
- wood siding will be removed from the previous display windows and a wood frame transom window with 3 panes of glass will be inserted into both sides of the recessed entrance
- the cast iron columns will remain and be painted to match the columns on the adjacent building
- 3 sloped, closed-ended fabric awnings will be installed that will installed matching the awnings on the adjacent building
- the existing round wood vent will be replaced with a matching wood vent and painted
- the existing wood upper story windows will be repaired, the upper sashes will be retained, and the lower sashes will be replaced with wood single-pane sashes that will create 1/1 operable double-hung windows

- a decorative metal ornament located at the top of the parapet will be fabricated and installed to match the ornament at the adjacent building

#### Rear Elevation

Ms. Young testified that all the windows at some time had been removed and/or bricked in. The first floor windows will remain bricked in for security purposes and the sills will remain exposed. She testified that new HVAC will be installed, and as much of the obsolete piping removed as possible. The existing stucco will be painted Ivory. The entry door to the left will be replaced with a 2-panel wood door, and a pair of wood 2-panel doors will be installed on the right side, one of which will be 36" wide for handicap code. Sloped, closed-ended fabric awnings in a terra cotta color will be installed over the doors. She further testified that 5 of the 6 upper story windows will be re-opened with 1/1 wood double-hung windows and painted.

#### Side Elevation

Ms. Young testified that the side elevation will be painted Ivory to match the side elevation of the adjacent building. The first floor windows will be retained, repaired and repainted, and the existing security bars will be repainted and remain on the windows. The 6/6 double hung windows will retained, repaired or rebuilt, and repainted. She testified that the metal fire escape, should they decide to keep it, would be repainted.

In response to a question from the Chair, Ms. Young stated that all the paint colors would match the adjacent building, as will the color of the windows.

It was noted by the Chair that even though a lot of work is being done, the majority of it is repair work.

Commission member Wayne Whitman commended Diane and Michael for bringing the building back to life.

There was no one present to speak in support or opposition to the request.

Anne Lyles made the motion as follows: "I move that the Commission find the following facts concerning Application #H-58-04 – that Diane Young, applicant for LMY, Inc., owner of 117 E. Innes St., appeared before the Commission and sought a Certificate of Appropriateness to renovate in accordance with an 11-point front elevation list, a 4-point side elevation list, and a 6-point rear elevation list; that no one appeared before the Commission to support or oppose this request, this request should be granted based on The Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation and Chapter 2- Changes to Buildings – Windows and Doors, pages 30-31, guidelines 1-4,6 and 8-11; Utilities and Energy Retrofit, pages 42-43, guidelines 7; Chapter 4 – Site Features and District Setting

– Lighting, page 61, guidelines 1-6; Chapter 2.4 – Materials and Details –Architectural Details and Ornamentation, page 29, guidelines 1-4 of the Non-Residential Historic District Design Guidelines; no mitigating factors; therefore, I further move that a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application H-58-04 be granted to Diane & Michael Young, applicants for LMY, Inc., owner, of 117 E. Innes St., to make the changes detailed in the application.”

Jeff Sowers seconded the motion; all members present voted AYE.

### **Committee Reports**

Minor works were presented by David Phillips. There were no questions from members.

#### Notes from Janet Gapen

Ms. Gapen informed the Commission that the deadline for the Incentive Grant applications is Friday, October 15<sup>th</sup>, and reported that 9 had been received. She stated that the Review Committee, consisting of 2 members from the Commission and 2 members from Community Appearance would meet during the week of October 18<sup>th</sup> in the City Hall conference room. Commission members Jeff Sowers and Wayne Whitman volunteered to be a part of the committee.

Ms. Gapen also informed the Commission that the Planning Board held the courtesy hearing at their last meeting for the continuation rezoning of B-6 to B-5 in the 4 quadrants of downtown. She reminded them that the 1<sup>st</sup> of the 4 was N. Main, the 2<sup>nd</sup>, S. Main, and the east and west will be heard by City Council on November 2<sup>nd</sup>.

In response to a question from Michael Young, Ms. Gapen stated that there had been very little opposition. She said the main concern had been from business owners who had voiced some concern about limiting the potential uses of their property should they decide to sell. Also, in response to a question from Charles Paul, she stated that the B-5 zoning is more restrictive than B-6.

#### Introduction of new Development Services Specialist and Senior Planner

David Phillips introduced Wendy Spry, the newly appointed Development Services Specialist, who will now be the staff liaison for the Commission. David stated that he would continue as well for a couple months during Wendy’s training

Janet Gapen introduced Preston Mitchell, the newly appointed Senior Planner. Preston follows Harold Poole who retired after 36 years with the city.

They were both welcomed by the Commission.

**Minutes**

The September minutes were approved by consent.

**Adjournment**

With no other business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

---

Charles Paul, Chairman

---

Judy Jordan, Secretary